DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 668 UD 017 193

AUTHOR Whatley, Juanita T.
TITLE A Comprehensive Child Development Program; Title XX, Final Report.
INSTITUTION Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 60p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Day Care Programs; *Day Care Services; Family Day Care; Low Income Groups; Preschool Children; *Preschool Education; Program Content; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Georgia (Atlanta); *Social Security Act Title XX

ABSTRACT

This booklet describes the Comprehensive Child Day Care Program for the Atlanta Public School System, a Title XX Program. This program provided day care services for children of clients in various categories. The program goals for 1975-76 were geared toward providing comprehensive day care to encompass social services to the family and developmental activities for the children. One of the goals was to provide for the social, physical, and cognitive growth of the pupils. This goal was met by an instrument labeled A System for Teacher Evaluation of Prereading Skills (STEPS) and Circus, a series of assessment measures used to identify cognitive developmental needs of preschool students. Results of the Cooperative Preschool Inventory, given to all students entering kindergarten, indicated that Title XX student performance was higher than that for non-Title XX students in 25 of the 29 Title XX schools for which comparison data were available. A longitudinal study was started using Title XX participants from 1972 and 1973 who were in the first and second grade. Scores from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for grades one and two were used for making the comparisons. It was found that those students who were in the Atlanta Public Schools' day care scored as well as or slightly higher than those students who had not been in day care. This fact was especially significant since low socioeconomic status had been considered to have an adverse effect on achievement. Parental involvement continued to be an essential part of the program. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142668

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION REPORT

Vol. X, No. 14 March 1977

A COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
TITLE XX FINAL REPORT

1975-76

Director
Mrs. Emmalean H. Bonds

Prepared by
Dr. Juanita T. Whatley

Dr. Jarvis Barnes
Assistant Superintendent
for Research and Evaluation

Dr. Alonzo A. Crim
Superintendent

Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

UD017193

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE
CITY OF ATLANTA

	Educational District
Mrs. Margaret Griggs	1
Rev. P. Warren Williams	2
Mrs. Angela Ioannides	3
Mr. Richard E. Raymer	4
Dr. Asa G. Yancey	5
Mrs. Carolyn Crowder	6
Mrs. June Cofer	At Large
Mrs. LeRoy A. Woodward	At Large
Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, President	At Large

Word Processing Staff: Bert Landers
Pat Harris
MiMi Phillips

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
Advisory Council	1
Staff Development	2
Fall In-Service for Expanded and Extended Day Staff	3
PROGRAM GOALS AND EVALUATION	
Program Goal I	5
Pilot Study of STEPS and Circus	5
Cooperative Preschool Inventory	13
Follow-Up Study of Day Care Participants	13
Monthly Program Goals and Special Activities	17
Program Goal II — Attendance	19
Program Goal III — Extended Day Activities	23
Program Goal IV — Use of Community Resources	23
Program Goal V — Guidance and Counseling to Parents	25
Program Goal VI — Parent Status	27
Program Goal VII — Parental Involvement	27
TITLE XX SUMMER EXPANDED DAY CARE, JUNE 9, 1976 — August 27, 1976	
General Objectives for Title XX Expanded Day, Summer 1976	27
Evaluation, Summer Expanded Day	30
COST ANALYSIS	30
SUMMARY	32
RECOMMENDATIONS	32

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
1	Evaluation of Expanded/Extended Day In-Service, September 25, 1976, McGill Elementary School	4
2	Systems for Teacher Evaluation of Prereading Skills, Number of Students Achieving Each Objective During Study Period, November 1975 — May 1976	6
3	Circus Subtests, Per Cent of Students Within Each Range — How Words Sound, See and Remember	9
4	Circus Subtests, Per Cent of Students Within Each Range, How Much and How Many, Look Alikes	10
5	Title XX Circus Subtests Means	11
6	Cooperative Preschool Inventory Fall 1976, Title XX Students	14
7	Cooperative Preschool Inventory Fall 1976, Non-Title XX Students	15
8	Summary Data, Cooperative Preschool Inventory Fall 1976	16
9	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) Results for Title XX Day Care Participants	18
10	Attendance for Title XX Day Care and Expanded Day, October 1, 1975 — September 30, 1976	20
11	Attendance for Title XX Extended Day, September 2, 1975 — June 8, 1976	21
12	Attendance for Title XX Expanded Day, June 9, 1976 — August 27, 1976	22
13	Title XX Categorical Parent Status, October 1, 1975 — September 30, 1976	28
14	Title XX Parental Involvement, School Visitations and Volunteer Service, October 1, 1975 — September 30, 1976	29
15	Title XX Expanded Day Summer 1976 Evaluation	31

INTRODUCTION

The Comprehensive Child Day Care Program for the Atlanta Public School System is contracted through the Georgia Department of Human Resources, Contract Services Division. This program, in operation since December 1972 under Title IV-A of the 1967 amendment to the Social Security Act, was funded effective October 1, 1976, under the 1974 amendment and became known as a Title XX program. The basic objective of the program, to provide quality day care to children in low-income families, remains unchanged.

Title XX day care service is provided for children of clients in the following categories:

A. Income Maintenance

1. Recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)
2. Recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI - Aged, Blind, Disabled)

B. Income Eligible — Based on family monthly gross income

1. Recipients of Medical Assistance Only (MAO)
2. Recipients of County General Assistance (GA)
3. Nonrecipients (who fall within a predetermined income range)

C. Without Regard to Income

Protective Services (as determined by the Department of Family and Children Services (DFCS) only) are provided to all individuals who request or require them without regard to income.

The eligibility determination process also involves setting a goal for the client which establishes the need for the service. The three goals that apply to day care are:

Goal I — Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency.

Served under this goal would be persons who are employed in job training, in school (directed toward vocation), or persons seeking employment.

Goal II — Achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency.

Persons assigned this goal might be temporarily incapacitated or unemployable because of age or mental and/or physical condition.

Goal III — Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests or preserving, rehabilitating, or reuniting families.

This goal is assigned by DFCS only.

These statewide goals for Title XX service shifted the emphasis, in the case of day care, from the direct recipient of the service (the child) to the parent who now is designated as the primary client. While this change basically has not affected the day care program, it does require a reemphasis on parental involvement.

Advisory Council

The four area-wide advisory councils, organized during the 1974–75 contract year, continued operation in 1976. The initial meetings were devoted to orientation and election of officers as required by State guidelines. Members returning from the previous year were able to give some continuity and to speed up the reorganization process.

Attendance at council meetings was much improved in Area I as some meetings were changed from evening to afternoon. Interest was high in center activities, and consumer members of the council expressed satisfaction with the growth patterns exhibited by their children.

A representative from the Atlanta Office of Consumer Affairs, Muriel Smith, spoke to the group at one meeting on Selective Buying. Plays for Living presentation on child abuse was one of the special features for the group during the year, and Ms. Emma Scott delighted the group at one gathering with pictures of children in action at Bankhead Center. A parent lending library suggested by the council last year was started at Carter Day Care Center and was used by a number of parents.

After the organizational meetings by the Area II Council, an "Introduction to Title XX and Its Implications for the Day Care" was explained by the Title XX Director, Emmalean Bonds. A special feature for

the year included a representative from the University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Service who presented a session on "Hot Tips for the Home Seamstress." "Art Experiences for Parents" was the topic for the July meeting.

The organizational meeting for the Area III Council included discussions on: state guidelines for the advisory committee, Title XX guidelines, attendance and health problems of children in the centers, and parental involvement. Plans were also made for other meetings during the year.

In May, the play, The Inner Tiger, was presented by the United Way Agency, Child Services and Family Counseling. Other meetings concentrated on: (1) the importance of parents keeping children in day care centers during the summer months and on regular school holidays and (2) activities to improve parental involvement and public relations.

The Area IV Advisory Council continued its second year of operation still under the direction of Walter Dixon. The most positive aspect of the council was the growth of the council officers even though attendance remained a problem. Council officers had a greater understanding of the role of the council and its leadership task. The council also assumed more responsibility for planning the five major meetings held during the year.

The year began with a get-acquainted meeting for members where Title XX guidelines and council operations were discussed. An exhibit prepared by Fountain's extended day students was available for members to view.

At two separate meetings, the focus was on community resources. Stimulating presentations were made by Elmer Rush, Assistant Director, Samuel L. Jones Boys Club; Officer Terry Parks from Community Pride; Calvin Cash, Fulton County Juvenile Court; Investigators P. H. Cassier and Larry Walker, DeKalb County Police Department; and a representative from THOR.

The election process was completed at the third meeting as required by State guidelines, and officers were installed by the Title XX Director, Emmaleen Bonds. At the final meeting, the Hubert Day Care staff involved the council members in "A Potpourri of Children's Activities for Parents." The adult participants were led through a simulated experience of a typical child's day at the center.

Staff Development

In-service training for teachers and paraprofessionals, as reported below, was supervised and planned on the area level by area resource teachers during the 1975-76 contract year. Teachers continued to offer in-service to paraprofessionals at the local school level. A record of the local in-service was reported each month to the Division of Research and Evaluation for permanent filing.

Area I — Helen Hill, Resource Teacher

1. Language Workshop
   Consultant — Helen Hill
2. Speech Development of Young Children
   Consultant — Octavia Milton, Coordinator of Pupil Services.
3. Math Workshop
   Consultant — Helen Hill
4. Art Workshop
   Consultant — Helen Hill
5. Parent Involvement
   Consultant — Ruth Blair, Title XX Resource Teacher, Areas III and IV

Area II — Millicent Wright, Resource Teacher

1. The Use and Care of Audio-Visual Equipment
   Consultant — Peggy Mapp, Audio-Visual Coordinator
2. Title XX with Emphasis on Job Descriptions
   Consultant — Millicent Wright
3. Preparing Learning Centers
   Consultant — Betty Blasingame, Elementary Resource Teacher, Area II

Area III and Area IV — Ruth Blair, Resource Teacher

1. Parental Involvement Can Make a Difference

   Specific aims — to help staff with techniques in achieving good parent participation in the centers. To help staff realize that parental involvement does not necessarily make things easier for parent or staff, but that it does make things better for children.

2. Aides in Storytelling for the Storyteller

   Specific aims — to help inspire staff to share stories with children to help improve storytelling techniques (prepreparation, presentation, and humanistic approach).

3. Puppet Making

   Specific aims — to help staff find ways of working with children to encourage free expression. To show that the use of puppets is one way of finding out a child's thoughts and feelings about himself.

4. "A Little Bit About a Lot of Things"

   Aim — to provide parents with activities that they can use at home with their children. A booklet of ideas was given to each parent present.

Area IV, Patricia Summers, Resource Teacher

Art Activities for the Preschool Child	Mr. David Walker Resource Teacher, Area IV
Science Activities for Preschool Children	Dr. Juanita Whatley Operations Analyst, Title XX Atlanta Public Schools
Music Activities for Young Children	Miss Sara Strong Resource Teacher, Area IV
Art Activities for School-Age Children	Mr. David Walker Resource Teacher, Area IV
Title XX Eligibility: Follow Up	Mrs. Betty Bartling Contract Services Representative
Area IV Advisory Council Planning with Family Service Workers	Patricia C. Summers
Small Group Conferences Staffing, Expanded Day, General Program Operation, Licenses	Patricia C. Summers
Water Play Workshop	James Long Childcraft Educational Corp.
Books for Young Children Exhibit	Mike J. Alex Western Publishing Co.

Fall In-service for Expanded and Extended Day Staff

On Saturday, September 25, 1976, a full-day workshop was held at McGill School for the expanded day and the extended day staff. An aide from each expanded day center, along with the extended day teacher and aides, were invited. The overall purpose of the workshop was to improve the quality of the expanded and extended day programs. The specific objectives were to: (1) review program goals and objectives, (2) review general operation procedures, and (3) introduce new materials for use with expanded and extended day students.

The workshop consultants, June A. Simpson from the American Guidance Services and Stan Glassman from Great Ideas, Inc., introduced the kits purchased for each program and lead small groups through lessons and suggestions for using the materials. Each extended day center was provided the Manipulative Place Value kit from Great Ideas and either Developing Understanding of Self and Others (DUSO), Level II, or Toward Affective Development (TAD) distributed by American Guidance. Each expanded day center was given a Peabody Language Development Kit, Level I, and DUSO, Level I.

The Peabody kit was to be used in expanded day to give enrichment activities in the language arts. The Manipulative Place Value kit offered fascinating activities for strengthening math concepts taught in the upper elementary grade. DUSO and TAD are programs of activities designed to strengthen social and emotional development. DUSO, Level I, is for lower primary, K–3, while DUSO, Level II, and TAD are for upper primary, 4–6. The evaluation results from the workshop are given in Table I. The workshop was well received, and no participant left without some useful information. The session rated the highest was the two-hour math session for extended day. No major weaknesses were reported, and most participants felt more workshops along the same lines were needed.

In-service for expanded and extended day staff is the most difficult to plan since this staff works directly with students the full time the centers are open. Saturday sessions are difficult to arrange since stipends are not always available. More attention will be given to this area of staff development in the future.

TABLE I

EVALUATION OF EXPANDED/EXTENDED DAY IN-SERVICE
SEPTEMBER 25, 1976
MCGILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

1. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the overall effectiveness of the workshop? One is the lowest rating and five is the highest.
Number of participants responding — 81.

Scale	Number of Responses
1	0
2	2
3	6
4	38
5	35

2. What do you feel was the most beneficial part of the workshop?
Total number of repsonses — 93.

	Number of Responses
DUSO Kits	3
Group Interaction	3
Exposure to new material	5
Working with kits	8
Peabody Kit	12
Program Operations	22
Math	42

3. What was the weakest part of the workshop?
Total number of responses — 71.

	Number of Responses
Introductory session too long	2
Too much for one day	2
Groups too large	2
No break except for lunch	2
Being in one cluster	2
TAD session	3
Workshop too long	4
Program Operations session	4
Math session too long	4
Saturday session	5
DUSO session	7
Not enough time in sessions	11
No weaknesses	23

4. What kind of future in-service would be most helpful?
Total number of responses — 83.

	Number of Responses
More of the same kind/add new kits	17
Follow up for materials introduced	11
Art, music, drama, dance	10
No comment	8
Educational games	4
Language and reading	4
Films, filmstrips/using machines	3
Teacher-made materials	3
Program Operations	3
Repeat workshop for day care teachers and principals	3
Meet to share ideas	2
Invite manufacturers to show new products	2
How to use materials already available	2

Topics suggested by at least one participant

First aide
Scheduling and managing a classroom
Maintaining interest of students
Grouping students
Fun-learning activities
Working with children who need social guidance
Advanced materials for children
Metric system
Opportunity advancement
Positive relations between staff, parents, and children
Puppets, role playing

PROGRAM GOALS AND EVALUATION

The program goals for the 1975-76 contract year were geared toward the Title XX service objective of providing comprehensive day care to encompass social services to the family and developmental activities for the children. Specific behavioral objectives were included in the proposal for each goal, but as activities for the year materialized, some of these objectives were replaced or eliminated. The evaluation, therefore, will be in terms of the general goals, and objectives will be referred to only where data were maintained by enough centers to give a reliable sampling.

Program Goal I — To provide for the social, physical, and cognitive growth of pupils enrolled.

The evaluation for this goal is divided into four areas:

1. Pilot study of a System for Teacher Evaluation of Prereading Skills (STEPS) and Circus, a series of assessment measures used to identify cognitive developmental needs of preschool students.
2. Performance of Title XX students on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory, a screening device administered to all students entering kindergarten.
3. Performance of former day care students (in grades one and two) on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS).
4. Program goals and special activities for day care, expanded day, and extended day.

The discussion of the evaluative data for each area is presented below.

1. Pilot Study of STEPS and Circus

In an effort to make a decision as to the type of systematic evaluation instrument to use in the day care program, a pilot study was conducted on the use of STEPS and Circus. Children who would be eligible for kindergarten in the fall of 1976 were used in the study. The purpose was to gather data as to which type of assessment would be most beneficial to the teacher in helping her to plan a program to meet the needs of the individual children. Since the major objective was not to compare instruments, but to compare use of information provided from the assessments, the result of the study will be discussed and analyzed separately for each instrument.

STEPS

The STEPS consists of 37 objectives arranged according to developmental sequence for four areas: Visual Perception, Auditory Perception, Spatial Relationships, and Cognitive Skills. The teacher, after estimating the child's level of achievement in an area, administers an assessment activity to determine if the child can perform the specific skill. The Student Assessment card provides all information necessary for completion of the assessment.

If a student is not able to accomplish the objective, the Teacher Resource card is available which gives activities that will provide the pupil with the experiences needed for the appropriate objective, and teachers can use other activities not provided in the kit. The Parent Assistance card that accompanies each objective gives activities that can be initiated by parents to reinforce instruction given in class. It was left to the discretion of the teacher to decide whether or not to use these cards.

Eleven schools used STEPS from November 1975 through May 1976. Periodic meetings of teachers involved were conducted to discuss common problems and to make sure the assessments were administered uniformly.

In May, Group Record Sheets were forwarded to the Division of Research and Evaluation for compilation to determine how many objectives the day care students were able to complete. The results are reported in Table 2. The numbers in each column for each objective represent the number of students that completed all the objectives up through that point. For example, at English Avenue, 24 students completed all eight objectives in Visual Perception while at F. L. Stanton, three completed 1-5, nine completed 1-6, and eleven completed 1-7.

Since STEPS is concerned with prereading skills, it was not expected that the day care pupils would accomplish all objectives. With no comparative data available, the performance of the students, therefore, cannot be rated as good or bad. The data can only be interpreted in terms of trends.

TABLE 2

SYSTEMS FOR TEACHER EVALUATION OF PREREADING SKILLS
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING EACH OBJECTIVE DURING STUDY PERIOD
NOVEMBER 1975 — MAY 1976

	Objectives	Area I English Avenue	Area I Frank Stanton	Area I Ware	Area II Crogman	Area II Pryor	Area III Williams	Area IV East Lake	Total	Per Cent
	Visual Perception									
VP-1	Matching identical objects	—	—	1	1	2	—	16	20	11.0
VP-2	Matching identical pictures	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	2	1.0
VP-3	Match color to color and picture to color	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	2	1.0
VP-4	Match two like color designs	—	—	2	8	8	1	4	23	13.0
VP-5	Match identical patterns	—	3	5	2	—	—	—	10	6.0
VP-6	Match capital letters	—	9	—	5	—	—	—	14	8.0
VP-7	Match lowercase letters	—	11	3	—	—	5	—	19	11.0
VP-8	Match similar letters	24	—	32	—	13	16	—	85	49.0
	Auditory Perception									
AP-1	Identify loud/soft sounds	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	0	—
AP-2	Identify duration of sounds	1	—	5	—	2	7	—	1	0.5
AP-3	Identify long/short words	—	14	17	2	2	15	2	15	9.0
AP-4	Match sounds to source	—	—	10	—	7	—	16	52	30.0
AP-5	Identify higher/lower sounds	—	9	12	8	—	—	1	33	19.0
AP-6	Identify high/low/lowest sounds	23	—	—	5	—	—	—	30	17.0
AP-7	Match picture to rhyming word	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	28	16.0
AP-8	Match pictures with rhyming names	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	1.0
AP-9	Group pictures by initial consonant	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.5
AP-10	Match pictures to initial consonants	—	—	—	—	13	—	—	13	7.0
	Spatial Relationships									
SR-1	Match five identical geometric shapes	1	—	14	—	4	1	3	20	11.0
SR-2	Match a picture in a row to a target picture	—	17	25	9	5	2	3	61	35.0
SR-3	Identify spatial relationships in pictures	—	6	—	—	3	1	—	13	7.0
SR-4	Match pictures that show direction	—	—	—	—	—	18	—	18	10.0
SR-5	Match outlines that show direction	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	7	4.0
SR-6	Follow a row from left to right	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2.0
SR-7	Identify a row and picture positions in row	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	10.0
SR-8	Match a sequence of geometric shapes	2	—	—	—	2	—	13	17	10.0
SR-9	Print words in left to right sequence	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—
SR-10	Mark on cue using various marks	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—
SR-11	Complete two-step directions	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	0.5
SR-12	Identify test symbols	—	—	—	—	10	—	1	11	6.0
	Cognitive Skills									
CS-1	Match similar objects	1	1	1	—	3	1	—	7	4.0
CS-2	Match similar objects with distractor	—	—	5	2	2	—	2	11	6.0
CS-3	Match a picture to a similar picture	—	9	19	—	4	8	7	47	27.0
CS-4	Match two similar pictures to a third	—	13	17	7	7	13	—	57	33.0
CS-5	Identify events of a story in sequence	—	—	2	8	2	—	—	12	7.0
CS-6	Arrange pictures in story sequence	20	—	—	—	—	—	10	30	17.0
CS-7	Name alphabet letters	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2.0
CS-8	Match lowercase letters to capitals	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	0.5
CS-9	Print letters in random order	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—
CS-10	Match color words to colors	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
CS-11	Match word to picture	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	—
Total	number of participants	24	23	44	17	25	22	20	175	

As a group, the students performed best in the Visual Perception area. This was expected since the teachers had discussed the heavy emphasis in this area and since this is the first area of concentration on the vertical plane of development. In other words, a student is expected to complete several objectives in this area before he is introduced to objectives in Auditory Perception and Spatial Relationships.

Initial performance in Auditory Perception was slow. Teachers were quick to realize this was an area that had been neglected. A child, for example, could "see" that hippopotamus was a longer word than elephant, but he had not been taught to "hear" which was longer. Some teachers felt the sound discrimination could not be made because hippopotamus was not a familiar word, but a reexamination of what is involved in auditory perception helped many to understand that word familiarity was not a prerequisite to sound discrimination.

The rate of introduction to Spatial Relationships and Cognitive Skills was not as rapid as the introduction to Visual and Auditory Perception. Teachers were cautioned not to rush or lead students through a mechanical completion of assessments in these areas since internalization of skills learned earlier was necessary before complete understanding could be expected. Horizontal and vertical development had to be watched carefully. One danger in using sequential objectives is for a teacher to use one assessment to determine the child's understanding of a concept. It must also be understood that familiar objects should not always be needed in assessments if true understanding has been accomplished.

At the end of the study, teachers were asked to comment on the use of the STEPS instrument. Their comments are summarized below.

a. The assessment activities were given by the teacher, group leader, or aide. Once group leaders and aides were given instructions on administration, they had little difficulty in working with the children.

b. Weak points of the program

(1) Too much time was required for individual assessment.

(2) Assessment required very little verbal response.

(3) Some of the language used in the assessment activities was difficult for the paraprofessionals.

(4) All the materials needed for each assessment were not in the kit.

(5) Parent response to parent cards was poor.

c. Strong points of the program

(1) Required individual assessment.

(2) Introduction of auditory objectives.

(3) Assess — teach — reassess strategy.

(4) Emphasis on sequential development.

d. How program was used

(1) In some schools, students were evaluated once a week and retested after instruction; average span of assessing, teaching, and reassessing was about two weeks.

(2) In other schools, objectives incorporated into regular program. (Assessment done after teaching had been completed.) Reassessment was often not needed.

e. Recommendations for teachers planning to use STEPS

(1) Become thoroughly familiar with the entire program and make the objectives a part of the regular instructional program.

(2) Collect all materials before the assessment is started. Become very familiar with complete assessment activity before beginning the activity.

Teachers were also asked to keep records of problems encountered in completing the activities from the Teacher Resource Card and to report other activities used in connection with each objective. The reports submitted are available through the Division of Research and Evaluation.

One weak area in the use of the program was with the Parent Assistance cards. Response from parents was poor, and many teachers did not use them. Many teachers felt the language on the cards was too difficult for the parents and were reluctant to send them out. Others waited until they were certain a child could successfully complete an assessment before it was given, thus eliminating the necessity for sending the card home. Much retraining on the use of the cards is needed.

Teachers were generally enthusiastic about STEPS but soon discovered it was not designed as an all-inclusive prereading skills curriculum. Many had difficulty with the required classroom management and record keeping. Successful use of STEPS for another year will require improved integration into the total curriculum and assistance with planning necessary for teaching and classroom management guided by objective.

Circus

Circus is a comprehensive assessment program that can be used to identify the instructional needs of preschool students. Instruments are available in 17 areas which make it possible to assess those areas of special interest to the user. The pupil's performance is given in sentence reports that indicate the competence level of the student for each measure used. These reports can then be used by the teacher to plan the level of instruction for each student.

Four Circus measures were used in the study: How Much and How Many, How Words Sound, Look Alikes, and See and Remember. The first three measures were given to the four-year olds in 17 schools during the first two weeks of January 1976. See and Remember was given during the first two weeks of May 1976.

The results from the measures are reported in Table 3 and Table 4. The raw scores obtained on each measure were used to determine a student's competency on a particular measure, and a sentence report for each child was returned to the center. For example, if a student received a total score between 17 and 21 on How Much and How Many and a score between 0 and 7 on the counting section, his sentence report would read, "Probably needs further instruction and practice with quantitative concepts, especially counting."

The data in Table 3 and Table 4 represent the per cent of students within each competency range for each school and for the day care centers throughout the System. The Atlanta Public Schools' students, as a whole, did not perform as well as the national sample on any of the subtests. However, it should be noted that in all cases excepted for How Much and How Many, the Atlanta Public Schools' sample size was larger than the national sample size. It should also be noted that the national sample was basically white and of middle to high socioeconomic status (SES).

The data reported in Table 5 show the comparative mean scores by race and SES. The Atlanta Public Schools' day care population, which is primarily black and in the low SES, compared favorably to the national sample. For the subtest, How Much and How Many, which pertains to quantative concepts, the Atlanta Public Schools' mean was the same as for the white sample and was between the middle and high SES mean. The Atlanta Public Schools' mean for Look Alikes (visual discrimination) was between the low and middle SES mean and lower than the white mean. No mean was given for the black national sample. The lowest performance was on How Words Sound, the subtest for auditory discrimination. The Atlanta Public Schools' mean was below the national mean in all areas. Students performed best on See and Remember, the subtest for visual and associative memory. The Atlanta Public Schools' mean was above the national mean in all areas. However, it should be kept in mind that this subtest was given in May 1976, while all other tests were administered in January 1976. All schools should carefully examine the data in Table 5 to determine areas of weakness.

TABLE 3

CIRCUS SUBTESTS
PER CENT OF STUDENTS WITHIN EACH RANGE

School	How Words Sound					See and Remember				
	N	1	2	3	4	N	1	2	3	4
National Sample	300	39	50	8	3	260	17	64	17	2
System	478	25	65	9	1	425	28	52	20	1
Area I										
Bankhead	23	4	65	30	0	19	0	42	58	0
Kennedy	54	20	59	20	0	45	40	51	9	0
Gideons	35	17	77	6	0	38	24	53	23	0
Area II										
Jones, J. M.	23	22	65	13	0	—	—	—	—	—
Area III										
Archer	8	50	50	0	0	8	75	25	0	0
Pitts	23	9	82	9	0	20	5	25	65	5
Area IV										
Burgess	27	56	44	0	0	19	47	47	6	0
Dunbar	38	11	79	11	0	38	21	66	13	0
Fountain	42	31	67	2	0	37	32	68	0	0
Gordon	24	46	54	0	0	18	44	50	6	0
Jones, M.A.	21	29	52	14	5	19	16	47	37	0
Kirkwood	27	19	74	7	0	27	7	59	34	0
McGill	23	17	61	22	0	24	17	71	8	4
Slaton	16	56	44	0	0	17	41	41	12	6
Toomer	23	0	87	13	0	22	5	95	0	0
Wesley	31	45	55	0	0	27	85	15	0	0
Whitefoord	40	25	65	10	0	24	25	50	25	0

1—Very competent
2—Generally competent
3—Probably needs further instruction
4—Appears to lack competence
N—Number of participants

TABLE 4

CIRCUS SUBTESTS
PER CENT OF STUDENTS WITHIN EACH RANGE

School	N	How Much and How Many: Composite 1	2	3	4	5	Counting 2	3	Relational Terms 2	3	Numerical Concept 1	2	Look Alikes: Composite 1	2	3	4	5	Complex Matching 2	3	Reversal Errors 2	3
National Sample	934	18	64	11	6	1	62	38	70	30	7	93	19*	51	27	2	1	57	43	92	8
System	476	12	61	18	9	0	49	51	48	52	6	94	13	44	39	4	0	43	57	92	8
Area I																					
Bankhead	23	4	35	43	17	0	52	48	22	78	4	96	4	39	52	4	0	35	65	83	17
Kennedy	51	21	59	14	6	0	41	59	55	45	16	84	30	54	16	0	0	74	26	100	0
Gideons	37	0	49	30	21	0	30	70	19	81	3	97	10	18	62	10	0	23	77	92	8
Area II																					
Jones, J. M.	23	13	79	4	4	0	78	22	57	43	13	87	9	39	39	13	0	35	65	83	17
Area III																					
Archer	8	25	75	0	0	0	100	0	87	13	0	100	13	87	0	0	0	87	13	100	0
Pitts	23	0	61	39	0	0	30	70	26	74	0	100	9	35	56	0	0	26	74	91	9
Area IV																					
Burgess	27	4	89	7	0	0	59	41	74	26	0	100	0	42	55	3	0	29	71	97	3
Dunbar	38	0	50	26	24	0	29	71	18	82	0	100	8	50	39	3	0	42	58	95	5
Fountain	42	21	64	13	2	0	69	31	69	31	12	88	31	43	24	2	0	69	31	95	5
Gordon	25	28	52	20	0	0	64	36	52	48	8	92	12	64	24	0	0	56	44	88	12
Jones, M. A.	20	10	75	15	0	0	60	40	65	35	0	0	10	42	38	10	0	43	57	86	14
Kirkwood	27	4	67	22	7	0	41	59	37	63	0	100	0	29	64	7	0	18	82	82	18
McGill	21	0	86	5	9	0	38	62	67	33	0	100	0	58	29	13	0	42	58	96	4
Slaton	16	25	56	13	6	0	56	44	63	37	13	87	31	31	31	7	0	63	37	87	13
Toomer	23	0	35	26	39	0	4	96	13	87	0	100	0	26	74	0	0	0	23	83	17
Wesley	31	0	68	19	13	0	42	58	29	71	0	100	19	55	26	0	0	45	55	100	0
Whitefoord	41	34	61	5	0	0	78	22	83	17	15	85	9	56	35	0	0	43	57	96	4

1—Very competent
2—Generally competent
3—Probably needs further instruction
4—Appears to lack competence
5—Instrument may not have provided appropriate measurement
*Sample size—250
N—Number of participants

TABLE 5

TITLE XX CIRCUS SUBTESTS MEANS

School	How Much and How Many N	How Much and How Many Mean	Look Alikes N	Look Alikes Mean	How Words Sound N	How Words Sound Mean	See and Remember N	See and Remember Mean
National Sample								
Black	106	24.95	28	*	66	36.17	113	*
White**	808	28.59	221	19.5	222	37.99	243	14.70
High SES	413	29.71	117	20.6	128	37.85	127	14.47
Middle SES	375	27.59	84	18.8	130	37.37	92	14.98
Low SES	146	24.49	49	16.1	42	36.21	41	14.51
Atlanta Public Schools	477	28.14	490	17.89	477	35.32	428	15.19
Area I								
Bankhead	23	21.61	23	16.65	23	33.13	19	11.53
Kennedy	51	27.92	54	20.89	54	35.67	45	16.58
Area II								
Gideons	38	21.29	39	15.31	35	37.63	38	15.21
Jones, J. M.	23	28.78	23	16.17	23	37.39	25	12.16
Area III								
Archer	8	33.13	8	20.63	8	41.13	8	18.00
Pitts	23	23.74	23	16.43	23	36.13	20	11.30
Area IV								
Burgess	27	28.59	31	15.81	27	40.15	19	13.63
Dunbar	38	25.76	38	17.13	38	36.21	38	15.21
Fountain	42	29.57	42	20.52	42	38.81	37	16.76
Gordon	25	28.40	25	18.96	24	40.04	18	17.33
Jones, M. A.	20	27.85	21	17.14	20	36.25	19	13.63
Kirkwood	27	23.70	28	14.96	27	36.78	27	13.15
McGill	21	24.48	24	17.38	23	33.91	24	15.33
Slaton	16	28.38	14	19.06	16	40.06	17	14.88
Toomer	23	18.39	23	13.74	23	35.09	22	15.27
Wesley	31	24.32	31	19.00	31	39.39	28	18.71
Whitefoord	41	32.97	43	20.05	40	40.47	24	15.21

*Numbers too small to yield meaningful data.

**"Spanish" and "Other" not given separately because of small numbers, but are included in appropriate SES.

Comments of teachers using Circus measures are summarized below:

a. The instruments were administered by both teachers and aides to small groups ranging in size from three to five members.

b. Weak points in the administration of the measures

(1) Group testing was difficult for this age. Children had difficulty working independently.

(2) Measures were too long and required too much time to administer.

(3) Children had difficulty handling booklets and keeping up with the testor.

(4) Brown background was objectionable to the teachers.

(5) Some pictures were complex and, in some instances, too cluttered, particularly in the measure How Much and How Many.

c. Strong points

(1) More than one area was evaluated.

(2) Children enjoyed the assessment exercises.

(3) Directions were easy, and the pictures were familiar.

(4) Repetition of pictures and terminology made the administration easier.

(5) A high level of observation was required.

(6) The results could be used as a guide for planning activities.

(7) Scoring of measures gave immediate feedback to teachers.

Teachers were asked to submit an outline of activities planned for children after the scores were tabulated for all subtests and sentence reports returned to the schools. These outlines are on file in the Division of Research and Evaluation.

The major drawback on the continued use of Circus measures is the cost per child and the time involved in giving each measure. Also, Circus is designed primarily for kindergarten children and does not include measures for social and physical development which are so important in the training of the prekindergarten child.

To determine if the kind of assessment instrument used made a difference in student achievement, the day care schools were divided into three groups, and scores obtained on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPSI) were compared. (Details on the use of the CPSI are given in the next section of the report.)

CPSI Mean Scores

STEPS Schools	47
Circus Schools	49
Others	51

The grouping was based on the assessment instrument used. The "other" group included those schools that participated in the National Day Care Study from October 1975 through May 1976. This study is designed to determine the effects of staff/child ratios and professionalism on the development of day care children. During the year, the children were administered the CPSI, Matching Familiar Figures, and McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities-Verbal Memory.

The differences in mean scores for each group are not statistically significant, and the differences that do exist cannot be attributed to the assessment instrument since the mean scores for the three groups did not change from the previous year.

Obviously, a decision on what assessment instrument would be best to use could not be made on the basis of the pilot study; therefore, the director, resource personnel, and representative day care teachers are working with the Early Childhood Curriculum Committee to refine and complete a Skills and Concepts Continuum that can be used as a better basis for deciding on the type of assessment that will be used. The STEPS kit will continue to be used as a part of the curriculum in 12 centers during the upcoming year, and some Circus measures will be used if funds are available.

2. Cooperative Preschool Inventory

One of the objectives for the year was that day care students entering kindergarten would score higher on the CPSI than students who had not attended day care. The CPSI was chosen for comparison since it was to be administered in September 1976 to all students entering kindergarten in the Atlanta Public Schools. This instrument is used to determine the level of a child's learning experience prior to entering kindergarten.

The areas covered on the CPSI are shown in Table 6 and Table 7 by the categories shown below. Table 6 gives data for Title XX Students, and data for non-Title XX students are given in Table 7.

I. Personal — Social Responsiveness
   - A. Self-Awareness
   - B. Aware of parts of body
   - C. Following one-order instructions
   - D. Forming position concepts (prepositions)

II. Associative Vocabulary
   - A. Identifying relationships
   - B. Directional concepts

III. Activation of Numerical Concepts
   - A. Number concepts
   - B. Comparing concepts
   - C. Ordinal concepts
   - D. Number conservation

IV. Activation of Sensory Concepts
   - A. Geometric configurations
   - B. Visual-motor tasks
   - C. Color and shape attributes

The performance for both Title XX and non-Title XX students in Title XX schools is summarized in Table 8. In this table, data are given for the four major subdivisions along with the total score for each school. Data are compared only for schools with Title XX programs since the students in these schools would come from families of comparable income levels and would be from similar communities.

Of the 29 schools for which comparative data were available, the Title XX student performance was higher than that for the non-Title XX students in 25 schools. The average total score for Title XX students was 49.3, and for non-Title XX students it was 43.2. Students performed highest in sensory concepts and lowest in numerical concepts for both groups.

The scores for both groups of students changed very little from 1974–75 when the average score was 49.2 for Title XX students and 43.3 for non-Title XX students. Day care students from Towns continued to be the highest performing group with average scores of 56.0 and 57.3 for 1974–75 and 1975–76, respectively.

3. Follow-Up Study of Day Care Participants

In previous years, all kindergarten students were administered the Basecheck at the beginning of kindergarten to determine pupil readiness and again at the end of the year to determine pupil growth. For the two years that data were gathered, it was determined that students who had been enrolled in day care scored significantly higher on Basecheck than those who had no day care experience. However, it was found that the difference was canceled by the end of the kindergarten year in all but a very few cases.

A concerted effort was launched, as a result, to go back and locate as many students as possible who had been in the day care program since the 1972–73 school year and to compare the performance of these students with that of their peers. Four-year-old students who were enrolled in day care in 1972–73 would have been in the second grade during 1975–76. Those enrolled in day care in 1973–74 would have been in the first grade in 1975–76. The

TABLE 6

COOPERATIVE PRESCHOOL INVENTORY FALL 1976
TITLE XX STUDENTS

	I PERSONAL-SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS QUES. 1-16					II ASSOCIATIVE VOCABULARY QUES. 19-30			III ACTIVATION OF NUMERICAL CONCEPTS QUES. 31-48					IV ACTIVATION OF SENSORY CONCEPTS QUES. 49-64				TSST TOTAL	N
SKILLS NO POSSIBLE	A 3	B 5	C 5	D 5	I 18	A 9	B 3	II 12	A 8	B 3	C 4	D 3	III 18	A 3	B 4	C 9	IV 16	64	
ARCHER	2.3	4.1	4.4	3.4	14.3	7.0	2.1	9.1	5.1	2.7	3.1	1.7	12.7	2.6	3.6	8.7	14.9	51.0	7
BANKHEAD CENTER FO	1.8	4.0	4.3	3.0	13.1	6.1	1.3	7.4	4.6	2.3	1.6	1.7	10.2	2.4	2.6	6.8	11.8	42.4	16
BETHUNE	2.4	4.4	4.5	3.9	15.2	6.7	1.8	8.6	4.5	2.6	2.4	1.7	11.1	2.7	3.1	8.4	14.2	49.1	23
BURGESS	2.4	4.3	4.7	3.8	15.2	7.2	1.8	9.1	5.3	2.5	2.5	2.3	12.6	2.7	3.5	8.8	15.1	51.9	13
CAMPBELL	2.8	3.8	4.5	3.8	14.8	4.8	1.4	6.3	4.8	1.8	2.3	2.0	10.9	2.5	3.0	7.0	12.5	44.5	12
CARTER	1.8	3.9	4.6	3.0	13.3	4.7	1.4	6.1	4.5	2.7	2.6	1.4	11.1	2.5	2.8	7.3	12.6	43.0	19
COCA	2.9	4.5	4.8	3.7	15.9	7.2	1.8	9.0	4.7	2.5	2.3	1.3	10.8	2.6	3.5	8.1	14.4	50.1	35
CRAIDOCK	2.2	4.6	4.6	3.6	14.9	5.2	1.6	6.8	4.4	2.6	2.3	1.4	10.8	2.5	2.4	7.4	12.4	44.9	16
CROGMAN	2.7	4.3	4.6	4.4	16.6	7.1	2.3	9.3	5.5	2.6	3.5	1.7	13.0	2.6	3.6	8.4	14.8	53.9	20
DUNBAR	2.8	4.7	5.0	4.4	16.9	7.5	1.7	9.2	6.6	2.9	3.1	2.4	15.1	2.8	3.6	8.5	14.9	56.1	32
EAST LAKE	2.5	3.9	4.6	3.1	14.1	7.6	2.6	10.2	5.0	2.2	3.1	1.7	12.1	2.2	3.3	7.5	13.1	49.4	15
ENGLISH AVE.	2.2	4.1	4.4	3.0	13.7	5.8	1.5	7.3	4.2	2.2	1.8	1.8	10.0	2.4	3.1	7.1	12.7	43.7	23
FOUNTAIN, WILLIAM	1.9	4.4	4.6	3.9	14.8	6.1	1.5	7.7	5.0	2.8	2.5	1.7	11.9	2.6	3.3	7.9	13.7	48.1	29
GIDEONS	2.8	4.4	4.6	4.0	15.8	6.7	1.6	8.3	6.4	2.6	2.5	2.1	13.6	2.7	3.4	8.0	14.1	51.9	37
GORDON	2.5	4.4	4.6	3.9	15.4	6.8	2.0	8.8	5.2	2.6	2.6	2.0	12.4	2.7	2.9	7.5	13.2	49.7	25
GRANT PARK PRIMARY	2.2	4.5	4.7	3.8	15.2	7.7	2.5	10.2	5.8	2.5	2.0	1.5	11.8	2.7	4.0	8.3	15.0	52.2	6
HILL	2.2	4.1	4.4	3.2	13.8	4.6	1.4	6.9	4.6	2.3	2.1	1.6	10.6	2.6	3.3	7.6	13.5	43.9	18
HUBERT	2.8	4.3	4.5	3.7	15.8	8.0	1.7	9.7	6.0	2.9	2.2	2.0	13.2	2.4	3.2	8.4	14.0	52.6	13
JOHN F. KENNEDY MI	2.1	4.3	4.5	3.3	14.2	6.2	1.7	8.0	5.3	2.5	2.6	1.7	12.3	2.8	2.9	7.6	13.4	47.6	44
JONES, J. N.	2.4	4.2	4.1	3.7	14.4	5.8	1.8	7.6	4.7	2.4	2.3	1.4	10.7	2.4	2.8	7.6	12.8	45.6	19
JONES, M. A.	2.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	16.8	7.1	1.8	8.9	5.9	2.7	3.2	1.8	13.6	2.8	3.4	8.7	14.9	54.1	16
KIRKWOOD	2.6	4.8	4.8	3.6	15.7	7.2	2.2	9.4	4.8	2.7	3.0	2.2	12.7	2.6	3.2	8.3	14.2	52.0	25
PITTS	2.2	4.1	4.3	2.8	13.4	6.3	1.6	7.8	4.8	2.3	2.7	1.6	11.4	2.3	2.8	8.0	13.2	45.9	19
PRYOR	2.1	4.7	4.4	3.6	14.8	5.6	2.0	7.6	5.2	2.6	1.9	1.8	11.4	2.6	3.1	8.2	13.9	47.7	9
RALPH MCGILL	2.5	4.7	4.8	4.2	16.2	7.3	1.7	9.0	5.2	2.6	2.4	2.0	12.2	2.7	3.3	8.6	14.6	52.0	25
REYNOLDS	2.8	4.7	5.0	4.6	17.1	8.2	1.9	10.1	5.9	2.8	3.7	2.3	14.6	2.8	3.6	8.8	15.3	57.0	12
SLATER	2.8	4.4	4.8	4.0	16.1	7.4	1.9	9.3	5.6	2.8	2.5	1.3	12.2	2.7	3.6	8.5	14.8	52.4	39
SLATON	2.4	4.5	4.5	3.5	14.9	6.0	1.7	7.7	4.3	2.3	2.2	1.7	10.5	2.4	3.3	7.4	13.1	46.1	19
STANTON, D. H.	2.5	4.2	4.6	4.1	15.4	6.5	1.4	7.9	5.8	2.4	3.2	2.0	13.4	2.5	3.5	8.6	14.7	51.4	17
STANTON, F. L.	3.0	4.8	4.7	4.5	16.9	7.5	1.7	9.2	5.0	2.8	2.5	1.8	12.1	2.6	3.2	8.1	14.0	52.1	21
TOOMER	2.2	4.6	4.0	3.4	14.1	6.3	1.9	8.2	4.3	2.2	2.0	1.5	10.0	2.4	3.1	8.1	13.6	45.9	17
TOWNES	2.7	4.8	4.6	4.2	16.4	7.6	2.6	10.2	6.7	2.9	3.8	2.0	15.4	2.9	3.7	8.7	15.4	57.3	14
WARE	2.3	4.2	4.4	3.1	13.9	6.9	2.3	9.2	5.2	2.5	2.7	1.8	12.2	2.5	2.2	7.6	12.3	47.6	31
WESLEY	2.5	4.5	4.8	3.5	15.3	6.3	1.6	8.0	4.5	2.5	1.8	1.6	10.3	2.3	3.3	8.4	14.2	47.8	24
WHITEHORN	2.6	4.2	4.4	3.4	14.6	5.6	1.3	6.9	4.7	2.4	2.4	1.7	11.2	2.6	3.3	7.7	13.8	46.5	26
WILLIAMS, A. D.	2.4	4.5	4.5	3.8	15.2	6.9	1.4	8.2	4.7	2.5	2.0	1.5	10.7	2.5	3.3	7.8	13.6	47.7	22
GROUP TOTALS	2.5	4.4	4.6	3.7	15.2	6.6	1.8	8.4	5.2	2.5	2.5	1.8	12.0	2.6	3.2	8.0	13.8	49.3	758

TABLE 7

COOPERATIVE PRESCHOOL INVENTORY FALL 1976
NON-TITLE XX STUDENTS

	I PERSONAL-SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS QUES. 1-18					II ASSOCIATIVE VOCABULARY QUES. 19-30			III ACTIVATION OF NUMERICAL CONCEPTS QUES. 31-48					IV ACTIVATION OF SENSORY CONCEPTS QUES. 49-64				TEST TOTAL	N
SKILLS NO POSSIBLE	A 3	B 5	C 5	D 5	I 18	A 9	B 3	II 12	A 8	B 3	C 4	D 3	III 18	A 3	B 4	C 9	IV 16	64	
BETHUNE	2.0	4.4	4.4	3.2	14.0	6.1	1.9	8.0	4.7	2.6	2.3	1.5	10.9	2.4	2.8	6.7	11.9	44.8	23
BURGESS	2.3	3.8	4.7	3.2	14.0	5.3	1.7	7.1	4.5	2.6	2.5	1.6	10.8	2.5	2.8	6.3	11.6	43.4	37
CAMPBELL	2.5	3.6	4.2	2.8	13.1	4.2	1.3	5.4	4.1	2.2	2.0	1.8	9.8	2.3	2.5	6.3	11.1	39.4	52
CARTER	1.6	3.9	4.1	2.6	12.2	4.2	1.0	5.2	4.1	2.2	2.2	1.4	9.8	2.1	2.7	6.3	11.1	38.3	42
COOK	2.8	4.0	4.6	3.5	14.8	6.2	1.4	7.5	4.6	2.0	1.8	1.3	9.4	2.6	3.0	7.4	12.9	44.7	44
CRADDOCK	2.3	3.9	4.3	3.4	13.9	5.4	1.7	7.1	4.7	2.3	2.5	2.0	11.6	2.7	2.6	7.0	12.3	44.9	23
CROGMAN	2.6	4.5	4.5	3.6	15.2	5.2	2.2	7.5	5.8	2.4	3.2	2.6	13.5	2.8	2.8	7.5	13.2	49.5	13
DUNBAR	2.0	3.6	4.5	2.8	13.0	5.5	1.6	7.0	4.5	2.4	1.9	1.6	10.2	2.4	2.5	6.7	11.7	41.9	63
EAST LAKE	1.8	3.6	4.4	2.1	11.9	5.1	1.3	6.4	4.0	2.4	2.3	1.5	10.3	2.5	2.9	6.4	11.8	40.4	42
ENGLISH AVE.	1.7	3.9	4.0	2.7	12.3	4.4	1.2	5.6	3.7	2.4	2.0	1.5	9.5	2.3	2.8	6.2	11.4	38.8	69
FOUNTAIN, WILLIAM	1.5	4.1	4.3	3.0	12.9	5.8	1.4	7.2	4.2	2.3	2.0	1.6	10.1	2.4	3.2	7.4	13.0	43.2	61
GIDEONS	2.5	4.2	4.6	3.8	15.0	6.4	1.8	8.1	5.0	2.6	2.0	2.2	11.7	2.7	3.1	6.8	12.5	47.3	46
GORDON	2.0	3.7	3.9	2.6	12.3	5.6	1.7	7.3	4.2	2.4	2.3	1.6	10.4	2.4	2.3	6.4	11.1	41.1	34
HILL	2.4	4.1	4.6	2.8	13.8	5.2	1.7	6.9	4.4	2.5	2.4	1.9	11.0	2.8	3.2	7.6	13.6	45.4	31
HUBERT	2.6	4.3	4.5	2.6	14.2	5.9	1.6	7.5	4.6	2.7	1.4	1.5	10.1	2.6	2.8	7.3	12.8	44.7	20
JONES, M. A.	2.1	4.1	4.4	3.4	14.0	6.2	1.3	7.5	4.7	2.5	1.6	1.5	10.2	2.4	2.8	6.7	12.0	43.7	52
KIRKWOOD	2.9	4.7	4.9	4.1	16.7	7.0	2.7	9.7	5.9	2.6	2.7	2.1	13.4	2.7	3.2	7.9	13.8	53.5	39
PITTS	2.0	3.8	3.7	2.3	11.7	5.3	1.1	6.4	3.8	2.1	1.8	1.2	8.5	2.3	2.3	6.6	11.2	37.8	92
PRYOR	2.9	4.6	4.9	3.6	15.9	5.7	2.2	8.0	5.1	2.9	2.9	2.1	13.0	2.6	3.2	7.9	13.6	50.5	27
RALPH MCGILL	2.2	4.1	4.5	3.1	13.9	5.4	1.6	7.0	4.5	2.6	1.6	1.4	9.7	2.4	3.2	7.0	12.6	43.2	38
SLATER	2.8	4.0	4.9	3.3	14.9	5.7	1.7	7.5	4.7	2.6	2.0	0.9	10.0	2.6	2.9	6.6	12.1	44.4	64
SLATON	2.7	4.2	4.4	3.1	14.4	5.2	1.5	6.7	4.0	2.4	1.4	1.4	9.3	2.3	2.9	6.3	11.5	42.0	27
STANTON, D. H.	2.0	3.9	4.2	3.1	13.2	6.0	1.4	7.4	4.0	2.2	1.4	1.7	9.2	2.2	2.9	7.2	12.3	42.1	43
STANTON, F. L.	2.8	4.3	4.2	3.6	14.9	5.3	1.4	6.6	4.0	2.2	2.4	1.4	10.0	2.6	2.9	7.5	13.0	44.5	31
TOOMER	2.3	4.1	4.1	3.0	13.4	5.5	1.7	7.3	4.7	2.6	1.8	1.4	10.1	2.5	2.8	6.6	11.9	42.6	47
TOWNES	2.7	4.2	4.4	3.4	14.7	6.6	1.9	8.5	5.3	2.5	2.6	1.7	12.0	2.4	3.1	7.1	12.5	47.8	80
WAKE	2.2	3.8	3.9	2.2	12.1	6.3	1.5	7.9	4.3	2.4	2.7	1.5	10.9	2.5	1.9	6.4	10.8	41.7	29
WESLEY	2.4	4.0	4.7	2.9	14.0	5.2	1.7	6.9	3.9	2.6	1.4	1.8	9.6	2.5	2.8	6.6	12.0	42.5	19
WILLIAMS, A. D.	2.5	4.2	4.5	3.7	14.9	6.3	1.7	8.0	4.2	2.3	1.6	1.3	9.4	2.6	2.9	7.5	13.0	45.3	26
GROUP TOTALS	2.3	4.0	4.3	3.0	13.6	5.6	1.6	7.2	4.4	2.4	2.1	1.6	10.3	2.5	2.8	6.8	12.1	43.2	1214

TABLE 8

SUMMARY DATA
COOPERATIVE PRESCHOOL INVENTORY — FALL 1976

School	Title XX Students						Non-Title XX Students					
	Number	Personal Social	Associative Vocabulary	Numerical Concepts	Sensory Concepts	Total	Number	Personal Social	Associative Vocabulary	Numerical Concepts	Sensory Concepts	Total
Total Possible Score		18.0	12.0	18.0	16.0	64.0		18.0	12.0	18.0	16.0	64.0
Area I												
Bankhead	16	13.1	7.4	10.2	11.8	42.4	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bethune	23	15.2	8.6	11.1	14.2	49.1	23	14.0	8.0	10.9	11.9	44.8
Carter	19	13.3	6.1	11.1	12.6	43.0	42	12.2	5.2	9.8	11.1	38.3
Craddock	16	14.9	6.8	10.8	12.4	44.9	23	13.9	7.1	11.6	12.3	44.9
English Avenue	23	13.7	7.3	10.0	12.7	43.7	69	12.3	5.6	9.5	11.4	38.8
Kennedy	44	14.2	8.0	12.3	13.4	47.8	--	--	--	--	--	--
Stanton, F. L.	21	16.9	9.2	12.1	14.0	52.1	31	14.9	6.6	10.0	13.0	44.5
Towns	14	16.4	10.2	15.4	15.4	57.3	80	14.7	8.5	12.0	12.5	47.8
Ware	31	13.9	9.2	12.2	12.3	47.6	29	12.1	7.9	10.9	10.8	41.7
Area II												
Campbell	12	14.8	6.3	10.9	12.5	44.5	52	13.1	5.4	9.8	11.1	39.4
Crogman	20	16.6	9.3	13.0	14.8	53.9	13	15.2	7.5	13.5	13.2	49.5
Gideons	37	15.8	8.3	11.6	14.1	51.9	46	15.0	8.1	11.7	12.5	47.3
Jones, J. M.	19	14.4	7.6	10.7	12.8	45.6	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pryor	9	14.8	7.6	11.4	13.9	47.7	27	15.9	8.0	13.0	13.6	50.5
Slater	39	16.1	9.3	12.2	14.8	52.4	64	14.9	7.5	10.0	12.1	44.4
Area III												
Archer	7	14.3	9.1	12.7	14.9	51.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hill	18	13.8	5.9	10.6	13.5	43.9	31	13.8	6.9	11.0	13.6	45.4
Pitts	19	13.4	7.8	11.4	13.2	45.9	92	11.7	6.4	8.5	11.2	37.8
Williams	22	15.2	8.2	10.7	13.6	47.7	26	13.9	8.0	9.4	13.0	45.3
Area IV												
Burgess	13	15.2	9.1	12.6	15.1	51.9	37	14.0	7.1	10.8	11.6	43.4
Cook	35	15.9	9.0	10.8	14.4	50.1	44	14.8	7.5	9.4	12.9	44.7
Dunbar	32	16.9	9.2	15.1	14.9	56.1	63	13.0	7.0	10.2	11.7	41.9
East Lake	15	14.1	10.2	12.1	13.1	49.4	42	11.9	6.4	10.3	11.8	40.4
Fountain	29	14.8	7.7	11.9	13.7	48.1	61	12.9	7.2	10.1	13.0	43.2
Gordon	25	15.4	8.8	12.3	13.2	49.7	34	12.3	7.3	10.4	11.1	41.1
Grant Park Primary	6	15.2	10.2	11.8	15.0	52.2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hubert	13	15.8	9.7	13.2	14.0	52.6	20	14.2	7.5	10.1	12.8	44.7
Jones, M. A.	16	16.8	8.9	13.6	14.9	54.1	52	14.0	7.5	10.2	12.0	43.7
Kirkwood	25	15.7	9.4	12.7	14.2	52.0	39	16.7	9.7	13.4	13.8	53.5
McGill	25	16.2	9.0	12.2	14.6	52.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Reynolds	12	17.1	10.1	14.6	15.3	57.0	--	--	--	--	--	--
Slaton	19	14.9	7.7	10.5	13.1	46.1	27	14.4	6.7	9.3	11.5	42.0
Stanton, D. H.	17	15.4	7.9	13.4	14.7	51.4	43	13.2	7.4	9.2	12.3	42.1
Toomer	17	14.1	8.2	10.0	13.6	45.9	47	13.4	7.3	10.1	11.9	42.6
Wesley	24	15.3	8.0	10.3	14.2	47.8	19	14.0	6.9	9.6	12.0	42.5
Whitefoord	26	14.6	6.9	11.2	13.8	46.5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	758	15.2	8.4	12.0	13.8	49.3	1,214	13.6	7.2	10.3	12.1	43.2

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores for these students are given in Table 9. The first and second grade scores are given for the 1972–73 day care participants and the first grade score for the 1973–74 day care participants.

The data have been presented in several different groups to get a comparative analysis of the performance of the Atlanta Public Schools' day care students who have remained in the School System. In 1974–75, there were scores for 5,924 first grade students and for 5,899 second grade students. In 1972-73, 491 of these first graders and 417 of the second graders were in day care. The grade equivalent and the age achievement quotient for the day care and non-day care students are the same for both grades one and two. This represents the basic group of students that has been divided into different categories for further analysis.

Group I. These students were in schools with Title XX centers. The assumption was made that these students were from similar socioeconomic backgrounds and from similar communities. Although those students who were in day care scored higher than those who were not, the difference was not statistically significant.

Group II. Students who were in schools without day care centers. (Group I plus Group II equal the basic group.) The difference between day care and non-day care participants is not significant, but it is of interest to note that the day care participants did perform slightly lower when placed in different environments.

Group III. The scores of day care participants who have remained in day care schools are compared with the scores of day care participants who have transferred to non-day care schools. This group is extracted from Group I and Group II. Although the scores for the students who are no longer in day care schools are lower, the difference is not significant.

Group IV. Similar comparisons were made for non-day care participants who transferred to day care schools. The scores of the non-day care participants who transferred to Title XX schools did not change.

Group V. A further division was made of the basic group to identify those students whose families were receiving Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Unfortunately, AFDC rolls for 1975 had to be used, which means that a sizeable portion of the sample could have been lost. In other words, it was not possible to identify which students were on welfare in 1972. Only those families that were on welfare in 1975 could be identified. The AFDC recipients who were in day care scored higher than those not in day care although the difference was not statistically significant.

On the right-hand side of Table 9, the same kind of data are presented for students who were in day care in 1973–74. This group would have been in the first grade in 1975–76. The comparisons are the same in the basic group where scores for the students who were in day care are the same as for those who did not attend day care. Any differences that appear in further divisions of this basic group were not significant.

Two important factors should be considered before the data are discarded as useless. First of all, it has been possible to only separate those students who have been in the Atlanta Public Schools' day care. It was not possible to take out students who have had other day care since prekindergarten experience is not recorded on the student's master file.

Secondly, it must be remembered that all Title XX students started out at a low socioeconomic level since this is a condition for eligibility. Since these students perform as well as other students at a higher SES, more research is needed to determine if day care has made the difference, or it must be determined if SES is a factor that affects achievement at the lower grade levels.

4. Monthly Program Goals and Special Activities

Each month the day care, expanded day, and extended day teachers are required to submit monthly goals and special activities planned to meet these goals. The activities reported are not the regular instructional activities but supplemental or enrichment activities such as field trips, special art projects, or visits to the center of community workers like Officer Friendly.

TABLE 9

IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS (ITBS) RESULTS
FOR TITLE XX DAY CARE PARTICIPANTS

	1972-73 Participants						1973-74 Participants		
	Grade 1 1974-75			Grade 2 1975-76			Grade 1 1975-76		
	N	GE	AAQ	N	GE	AAQ	N	GE	AAQ
Day Care Participants	491	1.8	104.5	417	2.4	98.4	601	1.9	106.0
Non-Day Care Participants	5,433	1.8	104.2	4,482	2.4	97.8	4,444	1.9	105.3
I. Title XX Schools									
Day Care Participants	383	1.9	105.1	293	2.4	98.6	465	2.0	106.9
Non-Day Care Participants	1,418	1.8	103.6	1,109	2.3	96.6	1,180	1.8	103.1
II. Non-Title XX Schools									
Day Care Participants	108	1.7	102.4	124	2.3	98.0	136	1.7	103.0
Non-Day Care Participants	4,015	1.8	104.4	3,373	2.4	98.2	3,264	1.9	106.1
III. Day Care Participants									
Day Care Schools	383	1.9	105.1	293	2.4	98.6	465	2.0	106.9
Non-Day Care Schools	108	1.7	102.4	124	2.3	98.0	136	1.7	103.0
IV. Non-Day-Care Participants									
Day Care Schools	1,418	1.8	103.6	1,109	2.3	96.6	1,180	1.8	103.1
Non-Day Care Schools	4,015	1.8	104.4	3,073	2.4	98.2	3,264	1.9	106.1
V. AFDC Recipients									
Day Care Participants	214	1.8	104.1	185	2.2	96.4	306	1.8	105.0
Non-Day Care Participants	1,711	1.6	100.5	1,471	2.1	93.3	1,497	1.7	101.5

The goals and activities submitted by the day care teachers are being compiled by the Research and Evaluation Division of the Atlanta Public Schools for detailed study by the day care staff. This compilation should serve as a basis for the examination of curriculum practices and problems. It can be used to answer specific questions such as:

1. Are the day care centers, in general, working toward the same curriculum goals?
2. Are the desired skills being included?
3. Is there heavy emphasis in one area to the exclusion of another? (i.e., heavy cognitive emphasis versus weak social development)
4. Are special activities correlated with goals?

If this examination of day care goals and activities proves effective, the study will be continued to include expanded and extended day. A sample of the extended day goals and activities is included later in this report under Program Goal IV.

Program Goal II — To enhance positive attitudes toward school attendance.

In order for the State to reimburse the Title XX Program for its full expenditures, the per cent of attendance must be maintained at 85 per cent or higher. Since the attendance forwarded to the State can include excused absences, no center has ever reported attendance below 85 per cent for payment purposes.

The per cent of attendance shown in Table 10 was computed without including excused absences to give a more accurate picture of the actual number of students present each day. The average daily attendance (ADA) represents the average number of students present each day, and the average daily membership (ADM) is the average enrollment for the day.

Twenty-two of the 36 day care centers had an attendance below 85 per cent, and three of the 30 expanded day centers were below 85 per cent. A high absence rate is not unusual for this age group, but attention should be called to the six centers where the average number of absences per day is nine or more. This absence rate is the equivalent of one staff person who would be needed and is provided for in the budget to maintain a required 1:9 staff/child ratio. Centers are now being required to study carefully the attendance patterns so that staff adjustments can be made in the budget.

To determine if the day care students have developed a more positive attitude toward school attendance, the daily attendance for the older students in extended day was examined and compared to the attendance of the non-Title XX students in Table 11. The per cent of attendance for the extended day centers listed below was equal to or greater than that for the regular school.

Area I	Area II	Area III	Area IV
Bethune	Campbell	Pitts	Cook
Carter	Slater	Williams	Dunbar
Craddock			Fountain
Stanton, F. L.			Hubert
Ware			Kirkwood
			McGill
			Slaton
			Stanton, D. H.

Even more important than the attendance is the average daily membership or enrollment which gives the average number of slots filled. If the enrollment is below 85 per cent, adjustment will be needed in slot allocations and will result in staff and budget reductions. The following centers had difficulty maintaining the requested enrollment during the year.

Day Care		Expanded Day		Extended Day	
School	Per Cent of Enrollment	School	Per Cent of Enrollment	School	Per Cent of Enrollment
East Lake	86	East Lake	75	Craddock	80
Grant Park Primary	83	Fountain	80	Ware	82
Kirkwood	79	Ware	83	Jones, J. M.	71
Williams	86	Wesley	62	Williams	85
				Hubert	82

TABLE 10

ATTENDANCE FOR TITLE XX DAY CARE AND EXPANDED DAY
OCTOBER 1, 1975 — SEPTEMBER 30, 1976

School	Day Care					Expanded Day				
	Slots Allocated	ADA	ADM	Per Cent Attendance	Average No. of Excused Absences/Day	Slots Allocated	ADA	ADM	Per Cent Attendance	Average No. of Excused Absences/Day
Area I										
Bankhead	34	28	34	82	6	—	—	—	—	—
Bethune	55	42	53	79	11	20	17	20	85	3
Carter	34	29	34	86	5	20	17	20	85	3
Craddock	32	24	30	81	6	17	13	15	88	2
English Avenue	40	32	39	82	7	24	18	24	78	6
Kennedy	100	78	98	79	20	—	—	—	—	—
Stanton, F. L.	36	33	36	91	3	21	18	21	87	3
Towns	37	32	37	87	5	25	21	25	86	4
Ware	72	62	68	91	6	35	27	29	92	2
Total	440	360	429	84	69	162	131	154	85	23
Area II										
Campbell	40	35	40	86	5	30	24	28	86	4
Crogman	24	21	24	87	3	25	21	25	86	4
Gideons	45	38	45	83	7	33	27	33	82	6
Jones, J. M.	40	28	37	76	9	19	13	18	76	5
Pryor	40	32	38	85	6	30	23	28	83	5
Slater	74	64	74	87	10	40	36	40	90	4
Total	263	218	258	84	40	177	144	172	84	28
Area III										
Hill	38	30	37	80	7	22	19	22	88	3
Pitts	38	34	38	89	4	35	28	35	79	7
Williams	43	30	37	83	7	—	—	—	—	—
Archer	23	21	23	92	2	—	—	—	—	—
Total	142	115	135	85	20	57	49	57	82	10
Area IV										
Burgess	44	36	44	79	8	—	—	—	—	—
Cook	90	82	90	91	8	40	35	39	91	4
Dunbar	43	38	43	89	5	31	29	31	93	2
East Lake	35	26	30	87	4	16	11	12	88	1
Fountain	59	52	59	89	7	44	31	35	88	4
Gordon	34	28	33	85	5	20	16	19	86	3
Grant Park Primary	29	21	24	84	3	14	10	12	86	2
Hubert	29	22	29	78	7	27	20	24	84	4
Jones, M. A.	38	33	37	88	4	16	13	15	88	3
Kirkwood	47	31	37	83	6	20	17	19	89	2
McGill	29	25	29	85	4	18	15	17	88	2
Reynolds	28	23	27	85	4	20	15	18	87	3
Slaton	29	20	23	89	3	20	16	19	87	3
Stanton, D. H.	34	21	24	88	3	30	26	30	85	4
Toomer	41	35	41	85	6	—	—	—	—	—
Wesley	74	62	74	83	12	26	14	16	88	2
Whitefoord	60	44	54	80	10	30	22	26	83	4
Total	743	599	698	86	99	372	290	332	870	42
Total All Centers	1,588	1,292	1,520	85	228	768	612	715	86	103

ADA — Average Daily Attendance.
ADM — Average Daily Membership.
Centers without data do not have expanded day.

TABLE 11

ATTENDANCE FOR TITLE XX EXTENDED DAY
SEPTEMBER 2, 1975 — JUNE 8, 1976

School	Slots Allocated	ADA	ADM	Title XX Per Cent Attendance	Non-Title XX Per Cent of Attendance
Area I					
Bethune	45	39	41	96	93
Carter	30	30	30	94	93
Craddock	35	27	28	95	92
English Avenue	30	24	29	82	93
Kennedy	50	45	50	89	91
Stanton, F. L.	40	38	40	94	93
Towns	40	36	38	93	95
Ware	50	40	41	98	95
Total	320	279	297	94	93
Area II					
Campbell	30	27	30	91	91
Crogman	40	33	40	81	93
Gideons	40	36	40	89	92
Jones, J. M.	52	31	37	84	92
Pryor	80	71	79	90	92
Slater	70	66	70	95	94
Total	312	264	296	89	92
Area III					
Hill	30	26	29	91	93
Pitts	30	29	30	96	90
Williams	40	32	34	95	92
Total	100	87	93	94	92
Area IV					
Cook	30	27	29	92	92
Dunbar	61	59	61	97	93
Fountain	30	28	29	98	93
Gordon	30	24	26	93	94
Hubert	60	47	49	95	94
Jones, M. A.	30	25	27	92	93
Kirkwood	40	37	38	96	95
McGill	50	43	46	93	92
Reynolds	40	35	40	88	93
Slaton	80	69	73	95	92
Stanton, D. H.	100	83	89	93	93
Toomer	40	34	37	91	93
Wesley	50	43	47	92	93
Total	641	554	591	94	93
Total All Centers	1,373	1,184	1,277	93	93

ADA — Average Daily Attendance.
ADM — Average Daily Membership.

TABLE 12

ATTENDANCE FOR TITLE XX EXPANDED DAY
JUNE 9, 1976 — AUGUST 27, 1976

Area I	Slots Allocated	ADA	ADM	Per Cent Enrollment	Per Cent Attendance
Bethune	20	9	19	95	48
Carter	20	14	20	100	68
Craddock	17	7	10	59	68
English Avenue	24	10	23	96	44
Stanton, F. L.	21	15	19	90	80
Towns	25	19	25	100	74
Ware	35	8	15	43	56
Total	162	82	131	81	63
Area II					
Campbell	30	18	25	83	69
Crogman	25	17	24	96	71
Gideons	33	19	33	100	57
Jones, J. M.	19	5	14	74	34
Pryor	30	12	22	73	56
Slater	40	33	40	100	82
Total	177	104	158	89	66
Area III					
Hill	22	17	21	95	81
Pitts	35	20	35	100	58
Total	57	37	56	98	66
Area IV					
Cook	40	34	36	90	93
Dunbar	31	27	31	100	86
East Lake	16	2	3	19	82
Fountain	44	20	25	57	79
Gordon	20	15	19	95	77
Grant Park Primary	14	6	8	57	81
Hubert	27	13	19	70	71
Jones, M. A.	16	10	11	69	89
Kirkwood	20	10	13	65	74
McGill	18	13	16	89	80
Reynolds	20	15	18	90	82
Slaton	20	10	17	85	59
Stanton, D. H.	30	19	30	100	65
Wesley	26	5	7	27	73
Whitefoord	30	10	18	60	54
Total	372	209	271	73	77
Total All Centers	768	432	616	80	70

ADA — Average Daily Attendance.
ADM — Average Daily Membership.

Summer enrollments for expanded day were another source of concern. Twelve of the 30 centers had enrollments below 85 per cent, and 11 of these were below 75 per cent. Not only was the enrollment low, but so was the attendance. A comparison of the ADA and ADM in Table 12 shows very few schools with acceptable attendance. Only Cook and Dunbar had enrollments and attendance above 85 per cent. These data on enrollment and attendance pattern indicated that expanded day service was not a critical need during the summer months when older brothers and sisters were home to care for the younger children.

Program Goal III — To extend the day of the school-aged child with relaxing activities that reinforce the academic school day, to provide training in constructive use of leisure time, and to promote the improvement of both adult and peer interaction.

Program Goal IV — To acquaint the participants with free and inexpensive community resources which can add an extra dimension to his education and help the family plan constructive use of leisure time.

These two goals are directed primarily toward expanded and extended day which involve the school-aged child. It is a challenge to the staff in these programs to provide the children with learning but relaxing activities. The activities are either related specifically to the goal of the month or to Goal IV mentioned previously.

Each month, the teacher is required to report the goals set for the month and the special activities planned to help meet these goals. A sample of the kinds of goals and activities completed in extended day are summarized below. Similar activities are reported for expanded day. No method has yet been devised to determine how successful the programs are. Complete records are on file in the Division of Research and Evaluation.

SAMPLE OF EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM GOALS AND ACTIVITIES

	Goals	Activities
Area I Schools		
Bethune	Arts and Crafts - Making pocketbooks, doll clothing and napkins from burlap cloth. Special attention to homework assistance.	Preparation for Halloween by making masks and building "Spook House" for day care children.
Carter	To strengthen math and reading skills through tutoring and games. To assist in development of good study habits.	Class presented puppet show to day care and expanded day classes. Previous days were spent learning to manage puppets, decorate props, and construct the stage.
Craddock	To direct activities in the areas of reading, puppet show, and arithmetic games. To motivate pupils in meaningful social activities and singing games.	Parents visited the Center for the Special May Day Program.
English Ave.	Identifying and naming different Atlanta landmarks with the use of maps.	Field Trip - Tour of Atlanta: The Omni International Hotel; Martin L. King, Jr. Memorial; Atlanta University Center; Piedmont Park; and the State Capitol.
Stanton, F. L.	To continue to emphasize the Bicentennial through reading and math activities, as well as field trips. To demonstrate responsibility and fair play during recreational activities.	Field trip to the Cyclorama and Underground Atlanta.
Towns	To provide enrichment in arts, handicrafts, games, and reading.	The children were introduced to collages and montages. Students from Atlanta Area Technical School instructed the class.

Area II Schools

Campbel	To make each experience a learning experience whether it is tutoring in an academic subject or reinforcing academic skills in games or free play.	Lieut. Batey from the Atlanta Fire Department came and talked to the children about fire prevention. For Halloween, there was a "scary house."
Gideons	Snacks to fulfill the nutritional needs of the child. Arts and crafts to motivate creativity for the child. Quiet games to give relaxation and pleasure plus to increase vocabulary in word games and to increase concept of numbers and place value in math games. Homework assistance to help extend the concepts that were taught in the classroom.	Older pupils were taken to the bookmobile in the community to see how it functions and the types of book they had. They were given applications to fill out to get library cards. We went for several walks in the community and discussed safety procedures for field trips.

Area III Schools

Hill	Recognition of various seasonal activities. Film strips and movies, books, etc. as follow up. Appreciation of various quick foods in cooking class.	Walks through the community each week. Recognizing and discussing where various children live and trees, birds, etc.
Pitts	Emphasizing safety in emergency weather situations such as: tornados, thunderstorms, and floods.	Practicing various emergency drills such as: fire, civil defense, and tornado. A civil defense representative visited the center and discussed the importance of drills and their relationship to our reactions in case of a true emergency.
Williams	To work closely with slow learners. In reading on initial and final consonants; and in arithmetic using flash cards with numbers from one to one hundred.	There were two young adults who came in to tell the children about voting. They want the kids to speak to their parents as a reminder.

Area IV Schools

Cook	To develop skills in reading and math through games. To develop skills in art and crafts. To improve skills in physical health through physical education.	Field Trip - Tiny Tots Concert.
Dunbar	To teach and reemphasize the importance of personal hygiene. To expose pupils to the culture and art of the African people.	Movies shown on cleanliness and personal hygiene. Filmstrips shown on African culture and art. African masks made by students in art class.
Fountain	To enhance the feeling of self-pride and to increase the pupils' ability to follow directions (specific) by having them work to their fullest capacity on individual projects (leather craft, ornaments, wooden boxes, and bird houses) to prepare them for exhibition.	The participants had a special activity for Thanksgiving. They learned songs or poetry. The older pupils gave a brief historical sketch of the meaning of Thanksgiving.
Gordon	Did work daily and methodically in basic skills in reading, art, science, numbers, physical education, and creative activities.	Had a dynamic program in school auditorium with more than 150 parents and other community people present to see arts and crafts display and to see pupils perform in a grand manner, showing the skills they had mastered in the program.
Hubert	Our goal was to provide a wealth of concrete experiences that are interesting and stimulating and which promoted conversation whereby the child is not inhibited in his thinking, acquisition of knowledge, communication of thoughts, and exchange of ideas.	A field trip to Mathis Dairy.
Kirkwood	To help students continue to develop positive self-control To help students continue to develop the idea of sharing and being kind to each other.	Community Nature Tour for winter signs.

McGill	To provide experiences in art, storytelling, ceramics, group games. Each pupil will participate in one closing activity by presenting to the group a project made or telling a story, reciting a poem, etc.	Story hour every Friday conducted by a visiting patron. Ceramics for children conducted by a visiting partron. Softball game - volunteer leader.
Reynolds	To help pupils improve math and reading skills. To help pupils control emotions and improve discipline.	Trip to Cyclorama and Grant Park Zoo.
Stanton, D. H.	Primary students - To reinforce and strengthen academic skills by letting them demonstrate through writing and orally their understanding of reading, math, and spelling skills. Intermediate students - To enhance and improve their physical and artistic abilities by engaging them in sports, art, and ceramics.	Students made a collage entitled "What America Means to Me" (this is my country) and displayed it in the auditorium during the celebration of the Bicentennial.
Toomer	To develop eye-hand coordination. To provide a means of self-expression. To promote communication in the family unit. To allow children to create gifts for family members using valentines as a theme.	Trip to the circus. Valentine heart fold cards. Linear string project. Physical education (rope skills).
Wesley	To develop skill in working with collections of pennies, nickels, and currency up to $5,000. To provide experiences in budgeting and spending money wisely. To provide activities in creative art.	Pupils made Christmas wreaths to hang on door in the school. Pupils were given opportunity to purchase items at their country store which reenforced the ability to learn the value of items and how to spend money wisely.

Program Goal V — To provide guidance and counseling to parents concerning health care, child-rearing practices, and family-related problems.

Guidance and counseling provided to parents is the primary responsibility of the family service worker. This responsibility might be met through direct, one-to-one contact with the parent; through referral service; through workshops; or indirectly through group activities involving all interested parents.

Regular, individual contacts with parents are recorded as required by State regulations on a Recording Information Sheet which must be maintained in the file of each primary client. Contacts with parents through group participation are reported monthly to the Division of Research and Evaluation. The reports, as summarized below, give a brief glimpse at the more formalized group parent involvement.

TITLE XX PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES
REPORTED BY FAMILY SERVICE WORKERS
October 1, 1975 — September 30, 1976

	Activities
Area I	
Bankhead	Took children for physicals and immunizations; Christmas program.
Bethune	No formal meetings reported.
Carter	Project — wedding of the Flowers; school carnival; family trip to World of Sid & Marty Kroft.
Craddock	Parent meetings — planning for activities.
English Ave.	Parent meetings — planning for activities; Halloween carnival.
Kennedy	Newsletters; parent meetings — orientation; workshop on discipline; classroom visitations.
Stanton, F. L.	Newsletters; parent meetings.
Towns	Christmas program; parent meeting — planning for summer.
Ware	Parent meetings each month, primarily for planning and coordinating projects and other activities. Projects — Halloween carnival; Thanksgiving grocery basket raffle; "Parent of the Year" dinner; tree branch decoration contest; Christmas party; health fair for parents; fashion show tea; candy sale; family picnic at Kingdoms Three. Regular newletters and news releases.

Area II

Campbell	Took children for dental evaluations; Thanksgiving luncheon. Parent meeting — consultant from Dairy Council of Georgia.
Crogman	Parent meetings — orientation; need for parental involvement; planning activities for the year. Observation of National Lunch Week.
Gideons	Assisted family service worker in taking children to the dentist and helped with the Christmas party. Veneral disease workshop conducted by representative from the State Health Department. Fun film workshop — learning to make flowers from "whimsy dip."
Jones, J. M.	Assisted family service worker in taking children to health center and for immunization update. Atlanta Council on Plays presented "Mirror - Mirror," problems of unwed mothers.
Pryor	Parent meeting — purpose and need for supportive service, orientation to Title XX. Project — fashion show.
Slater	Parent meetings — orientation for new parent; planning for the year; Christmas workshop; planning for banquet; presentation by THOR; Plays for Living presentation. Projects — fashion show; annual picnic.

Area III

Archer	No formal meetings reported.
Hill	Parent conferences; workshop; parent library used regularly. Parent meetings — orientation; health habits for young children.
Pitts	Parents participated in Annual Harvest Tea sponsored by the school; Christmas party.
Williams	Valentine party; newsletter.

Area IV

Burgess	No formal meetings reported.
Cook	Attended parent meeting with Cook Elementary School. No formal meetings.
Dunbar	Parent meetings — planning for project; basic Disaster Plan. Projects — Halloween bags; raffle, King and Queen Activity (school project with day care participation).
East Lake	Projects — participated in school's Halloween carnival. Parent meetings — community resources, guest from Human Resources (EOA) to discuss agency services.
Fountain	Parent meetings — role playing — how to teach children at home; nutrition consultant.
Gordon	Parent meetings — day care policies; parents designed games to help teach children alphabet (A - H) at home; Title XX orientation, "Cinderella's Valentine Day" presented by extended day. Assisted with taking children to clinic for dentals.
Grant Park Primary	Projects — Thanksgiving program (school-wide); Christmas party; family picnic. Parent meetings — discussion of planned day care activities, election of Advisory Council representative; preparation for moving center.
Hubert	Parent meeting — planning for Christmas activity. Center has had four family service workers this year.
Jones, M. A.	Parent meeting — election of officers, planning parent involvement in day care, suggested activities for the year; Christmas activities and planning sessions. Community Resources listing distributed. Project — bake sale.
Kirkwood	Parent meetings — orientation; "What To Do When a Tornado Strikes" session conducted by representative from Civil Defense Department.
McGill	Parent meetings — "Guiding the Young Child; other planned meetings interrupted by Title XX redetermination procedures.
Reynolds	No formal sessions reported. Center has had four family service workers this year.
Slaton, W. F.	Parent meeting — election of Advisory Council representative, orientation to class activities.
Toomer	Orientation meeting in September 1976.
Stanton, D. H.	Project — Halloween party — (emphasis on safety-concern over "trick or treat" experiences); Christmas program.
Wesley	Parent meeting — election of representative to Advisory Council; orientation to day care program. Project — fashion show.
Whitefoord	Parent meeting — The Young Child Comes to School; increased involvement with commitment from parents; planning for culminating activity.

All schools elected representatives for each Area Advisory Council.

Plays for Living, The Inner Tiger, a play on child abuse was presented on separate occasions for parents at Bethune, Craddock, Kennedy, Fountain, and Wesley.

Program Goal VI — To encourage families to become socially and financially responsible and self-sufficient.

This program goal is in line with eligibility requirements that all primary clients must be working or in job-related training if not otherwise incapacitated. The parent status is reported in Table 13. Income Maintenance represents welfare clients, and Income Eligible refers to clients who fall within a certain income scale set by the Georgia Department of Human Resources.

The per cent of welfare clients served has decreased from 60 per cent for 1974-75 to 56 per cent in 1975-76. Seventy-six per cent of the welfare families were employed in 1974-75 while 73 per cent were employed in 1975-76. This is particularly significant in light of the high unemployment rate for Atlanta.

Program Goal VII — To involve parents and other family members in the activities of day care centers and to keep them informed of community and school activities of particular interest to the family.

An open invitation is extended to parents to visit the day care centers whenever work or training schedules will permit. Many centers have regular parent volunteers who come each week to help with classroom activities. Day care, expanded day, and extended day teachers generally keep a record of these visits and volunteer services and summarize the activities in a monthly report sent to the Division of Research and Evaluation.

Table 14 gives a summary of the school visitations and volunteer services for all three programs. Although some schools were negligent in sending reports each month, the sample is large enough to give a reliable picture of how much support is received from parents. Throughout the System, an average of nine parents per month visit or assist with day care, three per month are in expanded day, and five render some service to extended day.

The types of service rendered by parents follow. Classroom assistance includes such things as reading stories, helping the staff prepare for lessons, or making games or other materials for the children. Contributions to the center would include refreshments for parties or materials for special programs. The other categories are self-explanatory.

Category	Per Cent for Each Category		
	Day Care	Expanded Day	Extended Day
Classroom Assistance	32	30	29
Contributions to Center	24	32	20
Visits-Class Observation/ Special Programs	16	20	21
Chaperon for Field Trips	25	18	30
Supervision During Staff Meetings/Workshops	3	--	--

TITLE XX SUMMER EXPANDED DAY CARE
JUNE 9, 1976 — AUGUST 27, 1976

A special program was planned for the kindergarten-aged expanded day students during the summer months while regular school was not in session. The programs operated from six to ten hours daily depending on the needs of the students and the attendance pattern for day care that would allow for sharing of staff. Teachers were asked to concentrate on three areas for the summer: (1) intellectual development, (2) creativity, and (3) physical development. General objectives were written for the three areas, and each center was asked to develop its own specific objective.

The general objectives used as the basis for the evaluation are given below. The specific objectives sent by the centers are on file in the Division of Research and Evaluation.

General Objectives for Title XX Expanded Day, Summer 1976

1. Intellectual Development

   After completing at least six weeks in the Title XX summer program, at least 85 per cent of the students will complete at least 85 per cent of the objectives set by the instructor in at least two subject areas.

TABLE 13

TITLE XX CATEGORICAL PARENT STATUS
OCTOBER 1, 1975 — SEPTEMBER 30, 1976

School	Average Number of Families	Income					
		Maintenance			Eligible		
		Working	Training	Other	Working	Training	Other
Area I							
Bankhead	31	13	3	6	10	0	0
Bethune	112	40	10	12	49	2	0
Carter	85	48	13	8	17	1	0
Craddock	56	29	8	2	13	2	1
English Avenue	77	29	8	8	28	2	1
Kennedy	146	41	12	9	81	3	1
Stanton, F. L.	93	44	0	0	44	1	1
Towns	88	32	4	5	44	0	4
Ware	150	62	10	1	71	6	1
Area II							
Campbell	100	47	20	15	16	1	1
Crogman	83	44	0	0	39	0	0
Gideons	119	72	5	7	30	3	2
Jones, J. M.	87	53	16	3	15	1	0
Pryor	84	50	0	0	34	0	0
Slater	155	74	22	26	33	0	0
Area III							
Archer	23	12	1	1	8	1	0
Hill	90	54	4	14	18	0	0
Pitts	73	37	3	4	29	0	0
Williams	66	45	3	8	9	1	0
Area IV							
Burgess	54	13	2	3	31	3	1
Cook	84	46	6	8	21	2	0
Dunbar	121	73	9	19	20	1	1
East Lake	52	20	5	1	24	1	1
Fountain	127	28	1	1	96	0	0
Gordon	84	24	5	1	51	2	1
Grant Park	35	12	1	5	19	0	1
Hubert	98	40	5	5	42	5	1
Jones, M.A.	73	26	5	3	35	2	3
Kirkwood	99	34	3	12	48	2	0
McGill	77	18	7	8	41	0	3
Reynolds	105	50	10	5	35	3	1
Slaton	117	22	13	19	57	6	2
Stanton, D. H.	151	67	20	9	54	0	0
Toomer	69	15	6	3	41	1	3
Wesley	148	39	9	4	77	4	4
Whitefoord	77	23	7	4	40	0	3
TOTAL	3,289	1,376	256	240	1,320	56	37
Per Cent in Each Category		73	14	13	93	4	3

Per cent of welfare families. 57
Per cent of income eligible families. 43

TABLE 14

TITLE XX PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT
SCHOOL VISITATIONS AND VOLUNTEER SERVICE
OCTOBER 1, 1975 — SEPTEMBER 30, 1976[1]

School	Day Care N	Day Care T	Day Care Avg	Expanded Day N	Expanded Day T	Expanded Day Avg	Extended Day N	Extended Day T	Extended Day Avg
Area I									
Bankhead	8	93	12	+	+	+			
Bethune	9	35	4	9	35	4	8	3	4
Carter	10	58	6	10	16	2	7	15	2
Craddock	6	29	5	*	*	*	7	15	2
English Avenue	10	89	9	9	17	2	4	4	1
Kennedy	10	266	27	+	+	+	*	*	*
Stanton, F. L.	11	76	7	10	62	6	9	93	10
Towns	10	103	10	10	38	4	8	7	1
Ware	10	97	10	3	17	6	*	*	*
Area I Total	84	846	10	51	185	4	43	137	3
Reporting Percentage		— 78% —			— 63% —			— 40% —	
Area II									
Campbell	10	87	9	4	0	0	2	0	0
Crogman	11	70	6	12	50	4	*	*	*
Gideons	7	43	6	7	39	6	2	1	1
Pryor	7	67	10	7	16	2	*	*	*
Jones, J. M.	2	44	22	*	*	*	*	*	*
Slater	6	183	31	5	28	6	4	12	3
Area II Total	43	494	11	35	133	4	7	13	2
Reporting Percentage		— 64% —			— 52% —			— 13% —	
Area III									
Archer	12	33	3	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hill	4	0	0	1	3	3	10	36	4
Pitts	12	45	4	9	5	6	10	25	3
Williams	12	56	5	+	+	+	10	130	13
Area III Total	40	134	3	10	8	8	30	191	6
Reporting Percentage		— 83% —			— 42% —			— 100% —	
Area IV									
Burgess	5	50	10	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cook	11	127	12	12	35	3	9	11	1
Dunbar	11	367	33	8	27	3	7	59	8
East Lake	10	60	6	9	22	2	+	+	+
Fountain	12	91	8	11	31	3	2	10	5
Gordon	12	46	4	8	7	1	6	17	3
Grant Park Primary	9	126	14	*	*	*	+	+	+
Hubert	11	57	5	11	3	3	1	0	0
Jones, M. A.	11	75	7	9	10	1	*	*	*
Kirkwood	5	53	11	5	72	14	8	57	7
McGill	7	60	9	2	1	1	6	86	14
Reynolds	3	24	8	2	21	10	8	9	1
Stanton, D. H.	8	56	7	8	34	4	8	32	4
Slaton	12	96	8	5	13	3	*	*	*
Toomer	12	46	4	+	+	+	8	47	6
Wesley	12	42	4	12	11	1	9	69	8
Whitefoord	10	138	14	10	57	6	+	+	+
Area IV Total	161	1,514	9	112	344	3	72	397	6
Reporting Percentage		— 78% —			— 62% —			—57% —	
System Total	328	2,988	9	208	670	3	152	738	5

[1] Extended day operated from October 1, 1975 — June 8, 1976.

N — Number of reports.
T — Total number of parent volunteers.
Avg — Average number of parent volunteers per months reported.
* — Center did not submit reports.
+ — Program does not operate in center.

2. Creativity

By the end of the summer program, each student will show evidence of successful participation in at least two projects designed for free expression, fine arts appreciation, or creative fulfillment. The evidence can be: (1) a product such as a drawing — an art object or a poem and/or (2) participation in a play, a dance, or musical presentation either as a performer or as part of the production crew.

3. Physical Development

Before the end of the summer program, each student will complete one of the following objectives.

a. Each student will successfully complete at least three physical fitness activities appropriate for his age level.

b. At least 85 per cent of the students will learn the rules and take part in at least five competitive and/or noncompetitive games or sports.

Evaluation, Summer Expanded Day

Each teacher was asked to keep a record of student progress from July 12 through August 20, 1976. The summarized results are shown on Table 15. Of the 29 expanded day centers, seven did not send reports. East Lake had only three students, and these were kept with the day care participants. The data submitted by Whitefoord could not be converted to percentages.

For Intellectual Development, most centers chose Language Arts and Mathematics. Slater did units on animals and self-image. English Avenue, Towns, Cook, and Grant Park Primary also studied other subjects as shown on Table 15. The percentages in the table represent the per cent of students that completed 85 per cent of the objectives set. Unfortunatley, only seven centers had 85 per cent or more of the students complete 85 per cent or more of the objectives in two subject areas. Four additional centers had 85 per cent or more of the students complete 85 per cent or more of the objectives in one subject. Achievement in the cognitive area was below the anticipated level.

Since all centers had two or more activities completed under creativity, the total number of activities required of each student is shown in Table 15. These activities included such things as collage painting, drawing, drama, handpuppets, poetry, sewing projects, role-playing, safety posters, music, and free expression.

Under physical development, 11 of the 20 centers successfully completed at least one of the general objectives as projected. Centers were sent physical fitness tests suitable for young children as recommended by the physical education coordinator. It included the agility run, seal crawl, shuttle race, and the 30-yard dash. Other games and/or sports were selected by the center staff and included such games and physical fitness activities as hat relay, tug-o-war, birds learning to fly, kick ball, ring game, rabbit hop, skipping rope, and other warm-up exercises.

The summer program was not considered a success because of the low enrollment and poor attendance. The poor attendance also affected the achievement of the objectives. The poor showing in this program has led to the conclusion that service is not needed in the summer for school-aged children.

COST ANALYSIS

The Title XX Program is funded through the Georgia Department of Human Resources, Contract Services Unit. The total budget for 1975-76 was $5,063,497. Of this amount, $3,797,623 was from federal participation, and $1,265,874 was contributed by the School System as certified or in-kind cost. The required administrative fee of $75,952 which represents 1.5 per cent of the total budget was paid by the School System to Contract Services.

School System certified cost includes expenditures incurred by System-, area-, and local-level departments that provide support to the Title XX Program. Included in the proration of certified costs are the salaries of superintendents, principals, administrative assistants, personnel, accounting, instructional resource staff, librarians, and maintenance staff. Nonsalaried certified cost includes office supplies and materials, items for maintenance and operation, use of space (including lease payment for one center), and furnishings and equipment that are used as a part of the normal school and/or center function.

The actual per pupil expenditure cannot be computed since expenditure records are not maintained by program components. The projected cost per

TABLE 15

TITLE XX EXPANDED DAY SUMMER 1976 EVALUATION

School	No.	Language Arts Per Cent	Math Per Cent	Creativity Number of Activities	Physical Development: Physical Fitness Per Cent	Physical Development: Games and Sports Per Cent
Area I						
Bethune	*	*	*	*	*	*
Carter	*	*	*	*	*	*
Craddock	8	75	75	—	—	100
English Avenue	13	92	69	2	—	62
Stanton, F. L.	16	100	100	12	0	100
Towns	25	88	84	5	—	100
Ware	*	*	*	*	*	*
Area II						
Campbell	*	*	*	*	*	*
Crogman	24	79	—	6	—	56
Gideons	*	*	*	*	*	*
Pryor	18	83[1]	66[2]	3	89	67
Slater	40	100[1]	100[2]	7	100	100
Area III						
Hill	22	100	100	8	—	100
Pitts	36	85	72	5	100	—
Area IV						
Cook	40	95	100	20	100	100
Dunbar	31	77	81	10	100	—
Fountain	24	—	63	10	92	96
Gordon	19	100	95	3	100	—
Grant Park	8	38	50	6	57	—
Hubert	21	76	—	3	86	67
Jones, M. A.	11	100	72	5	—	80
Kirkwood	12	75	58	8	83	—
McGill	*	*	*	*	*	*
Reynolds	16	81	94	3	90	—
Slaton	13	85	75	7	100	92
Stanton, D. H.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Wesley	5	80	80	3	100	100

Legend

*Data not reported.
—Did not participate in this activity.
[1]Unit on animals.
[2]Unit on self-image.

Other Subjects Studied

English Avenue — Music-92%, Vocabulary-92%

Towns — Science-96%

Cook — Classification-100%, Telling time-100%, Alphabet-100%

Grant Park Primary — Name, address, telephone no.-100%, Story Sequence-75%

child was $2,294 for day care, $1,024 for expanded day, and $461 for extended day. The estimated cost per child is computed from budget records and would vary only slightly if all budgeted funds were not expanded.

SUMMARY

The Title XX program operated during the past contract year with a minimum of disruptions caused by new eligibility guidelines. The most noteworthy feature of the program continues to be the dedication of the staff and the outstanding performance of the students as they enter kindergarten.

On the Cooperative Preschool Inventory (CPI) given to all students entering kindergarten, Title XX student performance was higher than that for non-Title XX students in 25 of the 29 Title XX schools for which comparison data were available. The average total score for Title XX students was 49.3, and it was 43.2 for non-Title XX students.

A longitudinal study was started using Title XX participants from the 1972 and 1973 contract years who were in the first and second grade this year. Scores from the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) for grades one and two were used for making the comparison. It was found that those students who were in the Atlanta Public Schools' day care scored as well as or slightly higher than those students who had not been in day care. This fact is especially significant since low socioeconomic status has been considered to have an adverse affect on achievement.

The average daily attendance for day care was 85 per cent, and it was 86 per cent for expanded day, which is the expected level for this age group. The attendance for extended day was 93 per cent which is the same as the per cent of attendance for all elementary schools.

Even more important than attendance is the average enrollment which must remain 85 per cent or higher if the project is to be reimbursed by the State for monthly expenditures. Although some centers had difficulty maintaining the required enrollment, the overall per cent of enrollment was 96 per cent for day care and 93 per cent for expanded and extended day.

An average of 3,289 families were served each month. Of this number, 57 per cent were welfare families, and 43 per cent were potential welfare families. In spite of the low unemployment rate for the area, 73 per cent of the welfare and 93 per cent of the potential welfare families served were employed.

A special summer program was conducted for kindergarten students who had been enrolled in expanded day. Because of the low enrollment and poor attendance, the program will not be continued for another year.

Parental involvement continues as an essential part of the program. Parents make up 50 per cent of each area advisory committee, and many visit the centers on a regular basis. During the 1975–76 project year, over 4,300 visits were made by parents to the day care schools. Parents have come for special programs to observe classroom activities, to serve as chaperones for field trips, to supervise while teachers go for extra training, to provide an extra pair of hands when needed, and to complete that most important link between home and school.

The total Title XX budget for the year was $5,063,497. Of this amount, 75 per cent or $3,797,623 was federal contributions, and 25 per cent or $1,265,874 was contributed by the School System as certified or in-kind cost. The cash outlay for the School System was an administrative fee of $75,952 paid to Contract Services. The estimated cost per child was $2,294 for day care, $1,024 for expanded day, and $461 for extended day.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to seek an evaluation instrument that will give growth data on all students served in day care. The completion of the Skill Continuum by the Early Childhood Curriculum Committee should facilitate this procedure.
2. Monitor closely the attendance of the six schools where the rate of absence was nine or more per day and the enrollment of nine schools where the per cent of enrollment was 85 per cent or less. Make adjustments in staff and/or slot allocations as needed.

3. Follow up on effectiveness of expanded and extended day in-service.

4. Monitor more closely the social service component to see if this aspect of the program has been adversely affected by increased clerical work required under Title XX.